

Remarks

The Office Action mailed March 26, 2008 has been carefully reviewed and the forgoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 9, 10, and 15-18 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-8, 11-14, 19, and 20 stand rejected. Claims 9, 10, and 15-18 are allowed. Claims 1-8, 11-14, 19, and 20 have been cancelled.

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's indication that Claims 9, 10, and 15-18 are allowed.

The rejection of Claims 1-8, 11-14, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-8, 11-14, 19, and 20 have been cancelled.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 112 rejection of Claims 1-8, 11-14, 19, and 20 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-8, 14, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Muzilla et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,908,391) ("Muzilla") is respectfully traversed.

By the above amendment, Claims 1-3, 6-8, 14, 19, and 20 have been cancelled; thus, rendering the rejection moot.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 102 rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-8, 14, 19, and 20 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 4, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muzilla in view of Mochizuki et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,152,294) is respectfully traversed.

By the above amendment, Claims 4, 11, and 12 have been cancelled; thus, rendering the rejection moot.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 4, 11, and 12 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 5 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muzilla in view of Dubberstein et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,159,153) is respectfully traversed.

Initially, Applicant notes that although at page 4 of the Office Action the Examiner rejects Claim 14 as being unpatentable over Muzilla in view of Dubberstein, it appears from the reasons for rejection that Claim 13, rather than Claim 14, is being rejected. Accordingly, Applicant proceeds as if Claim 13 is rejected as being unpatentable over Muzilla in view of Dubberstein and treats the rejection of Claim 14 as a typographical error.

By the above amendment, Claims 5 and 13 have been cancelled; thus, rendering the rejection moot.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 5 and 13 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric T. Krischke
Registration No. 42,769
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070